

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

VOL. VIII, No. 1

FEBRUARY 2, 1948

\$2.00 per year ; 10 cents per copy

Political Realities

THE first response to Mr. Wallace's announcement of his candidacy on the part of not a few liberal Americans may have been one of satisfaction. Whatever their misgivings over his alleged affiliations with Communists, they rejoiced that, at long last, someone had mustered the courage to throw down the gauntlet to the two established political Parties. Each of these Parties, held in the firm grip of its more conservative leadership, had successfully resisted every effort by its liberal elements toward reform from within, and offered the voters only the choice of the lesser evil. It is safe to say that the unspoken verdict of many a progressive citizen for many years past has been "a plague on both your houses." A Third Party appeared to promise the only hope.

As a matter of fact, the first result of Mr. Wallace's candidacy will probably be to assure the nomination of a reactionary as Republican aspirant for the presidency. Governor Stassen's admission that it has weakened his chances is as true as it is characteristically frank. Mr. Wallace has brought Senator Taft and his followers their greatest encouragement.

A second result of the Wallace candidacy, skillfully employed for propaganda purposes behind the "iron curtain," will be to convey to the Russian and satellite peoples an utterly false impression of the divisions among the American people. The election promises to reveal the weakness rather than the strength of the position Mr. Wallace espouses; but it will not be so interpreted.

The final result of the Wallace candidacy may well be to condemn the American people to reactionary leadership in the White House, whether Republican or Democratic, during four of the most crucial years of their history.

This is only the latest illustration of a truth which Christian idealists find it peculiarly difficult to accept—the contrast between alleged motives and anticipated results in politics and political actualities. This is one of the most fruitful sources of the disillusionment which dogs progressive idealism.

To be sure, sometimes the interests of political expediency parallel those of sound policy, and good results. A recent instance is the Republican insis-

tence upon aid for China. Chafed by the fact that, under a bipartisan foreign policy, most of the credit for its wisdom and accomplishments goes to the Party in power, the Republican leaders had been eagerly searching for an issue which they could turn to political advantage. The Administration's neglect of China gave them their opportunity. How far their sudden championing of China's needs was motivated by sound international strategy, how far by honest solicitude for the peoples of a hard-pressed ally, how far by desire for partisan political capital, no one can say. Sometimes, the Lord makes the wrath of man to praise him.

Sometimes, but not always. History may show the American policy toward Palestine to be an illustration in reverse. This is not to pass judgment on the justice of the Zionist cause, as to which honest men, including the editors of this journal, are divided. But there is little question that the advocacy of that cause by both political Parties is motivated less by humanitarian solicitude for a persecuted people in Europe than by shrewd calculation of the voting strength of their American kinsmen in certain key political districts. And if the Palestine partition should spawn conflict in the Near East for which American lives would be demanded, the final outcome might be fuel for the always smouldering fires of anti-Semitism—which may God forbend! Policies involving the welfare of humanity, which are determined by narrow and immediate political expediency, have a way of thus boomeranging.

What does all this imply for Christians? Not withdrawal from politics in their seeming sordidness and harassing confusion of good and evil. Rather, it encourages Christians to a shrewd and dogged discernment of the realities which actually determine political decisions. "Be ye wise as serpents as well as guileless as doves" lest "the children of this world be in this generation wiser than the children of light." Further, it counsels Christians to make common cause for goals which they believe to be right with political forces which may espouse those goals for quite other reasons, as indeed Christians must if they are not to be reduced to political impotence.

"Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of

unrighteousness." But it also warns Christians against attributing only unworthy aims to those who, as active participants in the maelstrom of politics, are inevitably caught in its toils. Rather, Christians should search for those whose advocacy of sound causes is motivated, even if only in part, by true appraisal and high purpose. For few good ends will ever achieve realization unless political expediency is buttressed by clear-eyed and high-minded support, not only from the general public but also from political leaders of character and courage.

What has been said comes to focus upon one specific issue of overarching importance in this turbulent election year. By common acknowledgment, the most momentous issue before the American people is the European Recovery Program. Just because of its transcendent importance, it is the most inviting temptation to political manipulation. Its success depends, perhaps more than upon any other factor, upon the resolute firmness of those Republican leaders who discern its necessity for the future of mankind, and who may have to risk alienation from, and even attack by, powerful elements in their own party in loyalty to truth. The role of Christians, so far as they can wield effective influence, is to insist that *this* issue shall be held above the interests of party advantage and to lend support to all those, of whatever party, who make this their guiding principle.

H. P. V. D.

Editorial Notes

It is too early to estimate the significance of the new organization that calls itself "Protestants and Other Americans United for the Separation of Church and State," but serious questions can be raised concerning the wisdom of its approach to the problem of Catholic-Protestant relations. The reference to "other Americans" suggests that this may become an alliance between Protestants and secularists who also strongly oppose any connection between Churches and public education but who, themselves, have developed in many cases a humanistic religion of democracy which they do seek to incorporate in public education. Catholics who believe that Christian teaching should be a part of education have the better of the argument when they dispute with Protestants who seem so willing to allow Christian education to go by default. This new organization would be more promising if it worked out a positive program for relating Christianity to education. The teaching of the subject matter of religion in the schools on as objective a basis as possible, and the improvement of methods of "released time" religious

education might be elements in such a program; but it is to be feared that this movement, judging by the well-known opinions of some of its sponsors, would oppose both. Meanwhile the only winners in this kind of struggle are likely to be the aggressive secularists who are able to insinuate their substitute for religion into public education, while Protestants look the other way.

This movement seems to be based upon a much too negative interpretation of the idea of "separation of Church and State." In so far as "separation" means that the Churches are free from control by the state and that religious liberty in the community is protected against ecclesiastical power, it is sound. But the Church and the State are concerned about the welfare of the same community and their spheres of interest are not separate.

"The separation of Church and State" should be the legal frame within which many positive relations between Church and State are established on a voluntary basis for the sake of particular objectives. Since the State has assumed major responsibility for education, and since education is a major concern of the Churches, it is very questionable to proceed on the assumption that the relation of the Churches to public education has been settled for all time in purely negative terms.

Let Protestants oppose the present Roman Catholic efforts to get public support for parochial schools and, even more, let them oppose Roman Catholic efforts to control public schools in communities where they are in a majority. But this opposition would come better from Protestants who show a concern for Christian education, equal to that of the Roman Catholics, and who see the danger to all forms of Christianity in the minority decision of Justice Rutledge in the New Jersey bus case, a decision that calls for "the complete and permanent separation of the spheres of religious activity and civil authority" and in which it is affirmed in the words of Madison that religion is a "wholly private matter."

The Supreme Court deserves all praise for its decision in regard to the admission of a Negro student to the Law School of the University of Oklahoma. The manner of rendering this decision adds to its significance. For this august Court to depart from its deliberate procedure in order to make sure that one girl has a chance to enter the University at the beginning of the second semester, dramatizes the best in our American life.

JOHN C. BENNETT.

Two Forms of Tyranny

REINHOLD NIEBUHR

IT is deeply ironic that our modern culture, which dreamed of the gradual elimination of "methods of force" in favor of "methods of mind" and of the progressive triumph of democratic government over all forms of tyranny, should encounter two forms of tyranny in one generation. It is baffling, as well as ironic, that the two forms of tyranny, Nazism and Communism, should be so similar in practice and yet so dissimilar in theory. Unless we understand how such contradictory theories of man's moral and political problem can issue in practically identical political institutions and moral behavior, we will not fully comprehend the breadth and depth of our contemporary crisis.

Nazism was the fruit of moral cynicism. Communism is the product of moral and political utopianism. Nazism believed (or believes) that a nation has the right to declare that there are no standards of justice beyond its own interest. Communism dreams of a universal society in which all nations will be related to each other in a frictionless harmony, if indeed nations will not disappear entirely in a universal brotherhood. Nazism raises the self-worship, to which all ethnic groups are prone, to explicit proportions in its theory of a "master race." Communism believes that ethnic distinctions are irrelevant in an ideal society.

Nazism regards power as the final justification of any action. According to its theory a nation which has the power to organize an imperial society beyond its own borders, proves its right to do so by its success. Communism dreams of an ideal society in which the state "will wither away" and which every form of coercion, force and power will gradually become irrelevant. It thinks that political power is merely an instrument of the property-owning classes, who require it to guarantee their special privileges. It is therefore certain that the abolition of the institution of property will create the possibility of a kind of millennial anarchy in which men will live in uncoerced harmony with one another. Nazism believes in an elite class which manages the affairs of the mass of men. Communism is fiercely equalitarian in theory and hopes for the abolition of all class distinctions. The "dictatorship of the proletariat" is, in theory, provisional. For the dictatorship of a small oligarchy, which has in fact established itself in the communist state, there is no place at all in communist theory.

The contrast in theory between the two systems is practically complete. The question is how practically identical political institutions can develop from these contradictory theories. The question

must be answered primarily by examining communist theory more closely; for Nazi theory and practice are consistent. The practice follows by logical necessity from the theory. Communism boasts that it has created a new unity of theory and practice. Yet it presents the modern world with the most shocking disparity between the two. The contrast is in fact so shocking that millions of confused idealists, even in the Western world, solve the problem by refusing to believe the obvious facts. It must be admitted however that this procedure becomes more and more difficult as the contrast between the generous and utopian dreams, which originally animated Marxism, and the tortuous politics of a Russian state become more and more obvious.

The evils of Nazism took us unawares because modern culture did not realize that the most refined standards of universal justice cannot finally protect a community, whether international or national, against the possibility of a pure and explicit defiance of moral law. Our every day experience with moral cynics, who acknowledge no law beyond their own interest, should have prepared us for the possible embodiment of moral cynicism in the life of a nation. But our modern culture was too confident of the innate goodness of man to entertain such expectations. In consequence we were overwhelmed by the appearance of Nazism on the stage of our history. We sought to comprehend it as a "reversion to barbarism." This explanation fails to take into account that human beings have the freedom to defy the laws of their existence. They can act as consistent egotists even though the higher law of human existence demands that we give each other mutual support. Naturally the increase of human power and freedom in civilized society increases rather than diminishes the possibility of such egoistic defiance. There is therefore no guarantee against the recrudescence of Nazism in the development from barbarism to civilization. A high degree of civilization makes human cooperation on a wider and wider scale necessary; but it also makes defiance of the law of mutual support more and more possible. If a defiantly egoistic member of the human community can secure the technical instruments for the attainment of his particular ends, he can, as in the recent Nazi case, come close to placing the whole community of mankind under his dominion.

We do not understand Communism if we fail to realize that it is a variant of the same utopianism with which the whole liberal world is infected. Communist tyranny, in other words, grows out of habits

of thought which rendered our generation incapable of anticipating or understanding Nazi tyranny. Communism turns the soft utopianism of modern culture into a hard and truculent utopianism. The difference between a soft and hard utopianism is that the former dreams of achieving an ideal society of uncoerced justice through the historical development of altruistic as against egoistic purposes; while the latter claims to embody a social system in which this miracle has actually taken place. A soft utopianism projects its ideal of a perfect accord between men and nations into the future. It is therefore free of the fanaticism and truculence of the hard utopian who claims to possess the ideal society and therefore also the right to deal ruthlessly with all enemies and opponents of his ideal.

The root of communist utopianism lies in the Marxist analysis of the cause of human egoism. According to Marx the original idyllic social character of man was destroyed by the rise of the institution of private property. This social and economic institution plays the role of the devil in communist mythology. If it should be true that a particular economic institution is the cause of all human egotism, it would follow of course that the elimination of that institution would make men completely social and would abolish all frictions and competitions in human society. Hence the vision of a classless society in which everyone "will give according to his ability and take according to his need" follows logically from the Marxist diagnosis of the root of human egotism. If it should be true that the state is merely an instrument for preserving the privileges of the propertied classes, it would also follow logically that a propertyless society would have no use for the coercive functions of the state. It would wither away. If it should be true that this desirable end cannot be achieved without a world-wide revolution of the propertyless classes against the property owners, the idyllic paradise to be attained would seem to justify the ruthless policies pursued in the conflict. It would seem also to justify a provisional dictatorship, which will give cohesion and striking power to the cohorts of redemption. If this provisional dictatorship seems to have inordinate power, the utopian need not worry over-much about the perils of such power, since, according to his theory, all political power will atrophy in the day when a complete victory has been won. It may be questioned whether the Russian oligarchy which now controls the destinies of a nation committed to the achievement of such an ideal never-never land, is animated by these utopian dreams. The possession of power is sweet and the corruptions of power are great. We may assume therefore that those who exercise this power do not concern themselves too much with the dreams which originally endowed their power with moral legitimacy. But it is important to recognize that

in the eyes of the faithful the power which this oligarchy exercises is still in a completely different category than the power of Nazi oligarchs. Furthermore the capacity of the human soul for self-deception is so great that some of these Russian oligarchs may, for all we know, feel themselves completely justified by the original dream.

But speculation about the mixture of motives in the soul of the oligarch is comparatively irrelevant. The important point is that Communism, as we know it, is a political system in which a provisional moral cynicism, which countenances the defiance of the moral experience of the human race, is justified by a moral utopianism which dreams of the achievement of an ideal world in which property, government, nationality and ethnic distinctions will all disappear. Since the communist hope is an illusion, the objective observer must recognize the provisional cynicism as no different than the basic cynicism of the Nazis even as he knows that a supposedly provisional dictatorship follows the same practices as one which claimed permanent tenure.

While it is important to recognize that diametrically opposite conceptions of human nature may thus produce common unscrupulous and ruthless political practices and despotic political institutions, it is nevertheless important to bear the differences in basic theory in mind. One reason for doing this is that the corruption of an ideal dream may be politically more dangerous than a frankly cynical political program. The Nazis were, for instance, frustrated in their ambition to rule a continent and a world by their senseless self-worship. It is ridiculous to ask a subject people to violate their sense of self-respect by holding the conqueror in religious veneration. The Russian will-to-power is more subtly related to the communist cause. Russia comes to every nation, which it intends to subjugate, as a "liberator" from "fascist" and "imperialist" oppression. Russian nationalism is related to the communist dream as Napoleon's French nationalism was related to the liberal dream of the 18th century. The difference between the nationalism of the Nazis and the nationalism of the Russian Communists is the difference between the "honest" moral cynic and the misguided or self-deceived idealist, who fails to recognize to what degree self-interest corrupts even the most ideal motives. The Russians are fortunately technically weaker than the Nazis. Otherwise we would long since have discovered that a corrupted ideal may be more potent than a frank defiance of all ideal values. The proof of that higher potency is given by the fact that Russia's so-called "fifth columns" in the Western world are composed not of the miserable traitors who constituted the Nazi dominated "Bund," nor yet of mere communist party hacks. They contain thousands of misguided idealists who still think that Russia is the midwife of an ideal society, about to be born.

But there is an even more important reason for noting the difference between the utopian and the cynical bases of these two forms of tyranny. It will not do to fight a despotism, which had its inspiration in utopianism, merely by calling attention to crass corruption of the original ideal. It is necessary for a democratic civilization to recognize the weakness in its own life which gave power and plausibility to this dream. The basic error from which all subsequent Marxist illusions spring is the belief that the institution of property is the root-source of all anti-social tendencies in human nature. This is merely another version of many liberal interpretations of human nature in the 18th and 19th century which attributed human evil primarily to faulty political institutions. All purely social and institutional interpretations of human evil are obviously wrong. Man's capacity and willingness to seek his own ends at the expense of the commonweal may gain institutional instruments but cannot be explained by them. As a matter of fact the primary purpose of the institutions of both property and government is to prevent men from taking advantage of each other.

But it ought to be obvious that the power of both property and government can become the source of injustice, even though its primary purpose is the preservation of justice. All forms of inordinate power are in fact a peril to justice and community; for excess of power tempts its possessor to use it, not for security of the self but for the aggrandizement of the self against others. It is important therefore that a technical civilization such as ours, which elaborates ever more complex forms of power in the realm of both economics and politics, maintain a pragmatic attitude toward the problem of power in both realms. Actually our liberal or democratic culture, which arose in the eighteenth century maintained a critical attitude toward political power, regarding it as the potential source of injustice; but it became increasingly uncritical toward economic power, assuming it to be the source of justice. Thus property rights were made more absolute in an industrial and commercial society than they were in the older agrarian society despite the fact that a technical civilization created new perils of economic power which did not exist in an agrarian civilization. It was this error which invited, in a sense, the counter-error of Marxism. Thus a religious veneration of the institution of property led to a new religion which sought the redemption of mankind through the abolition of property. Since Marxism erroneously assumed that economic power inhered altogether in the ownership of property, failing to recognize that the power of the manager of economic process would persist even in a society devoid of private property, its policy of socialization merely resulted in turning both economic and political power over to a single

oligarchy, thus increasing the danger of tyranny. This error, added to all of its other miscalculations of human nature and history, accentuated its drift toward despotism.

But these gross miscalculations of Marxism must not obscure the errors of a liberal society which gave plausibility and credibility to Marxist illusions. It is particularly important for Americans to be humble about these errors; for the illusions of a liberal society persist in a more naive form in our own nation than in any other modern industrial country. We are thus constantly tempted to give the highly implausible Marxist creed a new plausibility by our own naive dogmatism. Perhaps the final irony of history in our contemporary situation lies in the fact that America's power should have made us the prime bulwark against communist aggression upon democracy. For we mix our devotion to democracy with illusions about the relation of the economic process to the cause of justice, which could only have arisen and persisted in a nation as favored as ours, and therefore as comparatively free from the desperate problems of justice which an impoverished European society faces. As far as Europe is concerned we are not an ideal St. George to kill the communist dragon. We merely call attention to the fact that the dragon has teeth and jaws, very similar to those of a horrible beast we recently laid low. The teeth and jaws are in fact very similar. But the dragon was originally himself a St. George, contending against evil; and part of his power is derived, not from his teeth of tyranny but from the original St. Georgian aura, with which he is invested.

Geneva: Report on Theological Education in Europe

Lack of competent professors to fill vacant posts, a dearth of theological literature, and isolation of students from those in other countries were cited as primary common problems facing their seminaries in reports from delegates representing theological faculties in Austria, Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary and Poland.

The reports were presented at a four-day conference on theological education attended by theological professors from fourteen European countries at Chateau de Bossey, near Geneva, under auspices of the World Council of Churches' Department of Reconstruction and Inter-Church Aid.

Theological students in all countries were lauded by delegates for their commitment to the ministry in spite of difficult financial obstacles, and their maturity resulting partially from their experiences during the war which brought them into closer contact with all social classes.

It was reported that in England and Scotland, as well as in Germany, Hungary, and other countries, many more capable clergymen are needed to fill vacancies. RNS.

Realism and Idealism in the Methodist Youth Conference

JOHN D. WOLF

I HAVE just returned from the great Methodist Youth Conference held during the Christmas holidays in Cleveland's Public Auditorium. Over 9,000 youth delegates and 1,000 adult leaders gathered for three days in what has been called "the greatest conference of Christian youth in a generation." An imposing battery of youth speakers including Harold Case, Paul Quillian, Richard Raines, Bishop Ralph Magee and E. Stanley Jones, found a receptive, serious audience, devoid of horse-play and the restlessness so often characteristic of youth assemblies where the average age is 17.

Methodist or non-Methodist, one could not help feeling a great thrill at this conference. We adult leaders found ourselves unconsciously comparing its pulse and message with that of the pre-war period. There was great similarity. The same devil was uppermost, War, together with its compatriots hunger, racial intolerance, and injustice. There was the same urgency in the Atomic as in the pre-Atomic age, though the words were scarcely mentioned. There was the same emphasis on the Social Gospel with the personal gospel largely limited to the simple moralisms of "don't drink, don't smoke, keep pure." There were the same simple answers to the same perplexing problems of the human race: Where there is division, we need unity. Where there is hatred and violence, we need love. Where there is nationalism, we need universal brotherhood.

Toward the number one evil, War, it was clearly evident that the answer of the leaders of Methodism was still pacifism. It has long been known that the Commission on World Peace, headed by Ralph Sockman and Charles Boss, Jr., holds the pacifist interpretation of world events before the church. Evidently the Youth Department of the Board of Education is also of this mind.

The answer to the war problem was most clearly portrayed in a beautifully presented drama, "The Mighty Dream," written especially for the conference by the novelist Dorothy Clarke Wilson. This production depicted the chaotic future ahead of the new generation as it sought to extricate itself from the problems of war, hunger, ignorance and racial intolerance. God's guidance was given through Moses, Isaiah and finally in Jesus, "Law of the Kingdom: Love one another." In the final scene entitled, "Man made godlike: the co-creators of a brave new world fulfill the mighty dream"; Francis of Assisi, Luther, Wesley, Gandhi, and George Washington Carver are regarded as the representatives of the "co-creators." They had found the answer by heeding God above the appeal-

ing cries for loyalty from the military, business, ecclesiastics, etc. One could not help feeling that the way of non-violence was the key that opened the door out of chaos. Otherwise, why the inclusion of Hindu Gandhi?

What this writer regrets in this conference was the absence of wisdom from the mistakes of the prewar youth crusades against war. Pacifist movements in the church, led almost wholly by well-meaning clergymen, brought nothing but disillusionment and frustration to millions of youth.

If the purpose of the movement was to stop war by disavowal or to make witnessing conscientious objectors, the movement must be said to have largely failed. The primary effect, however, was one of bewildering confusion. This was seen in the failure of Methodist clergymen to fill their quota in the chaplaincy until well near the end of the war. A further result was to blur the ethical judgment of the church leaders. Having made war the demigod, the Nazi-Fascist-Shinto combine became a secondary evil. (Curiously enough the same thing happened among Roman Catholics who made Communism the incarnation of evil and thus placed Fascism in secondary position.) How else could one explain the action of the General Conference of 1944 in supporting the war by only the slimmest of margins?

Furthermore, every minister and chaplain knows the moral struggle of conscientious religious youths who were told that war was the worst of sins and then found themselves in it. Having supported the pacifist movement of the church they were given little guidance in defining the issues at stake in the war and the part God plays in the midst of a sinful situation. Now the veteran's cynical disillusionment is expressed in placid resignation toward the church and inertia toward movements designed to "bring in the Kingdom." Although some blame must rest with the war itself for this state of mind, at least a good share rests upon the church leaders who failed to admit the probability of "set-backs" in the Kingdom's work and then prepare the youth to meet them.

Why do we shield youth from the tragedy of life? Are they not capable of realism as well as idealism? One can move in the realm of endeavor for God and still realize (and not be a cynic either) that man's hardened sin might well bring chaos despite our endeavors. Is the Kingdom then lost? Of course not. It is a shallow gospel that does not prepare its people for meeting disappointment, pain, death, or catastrophe.

Basically the issue lies deeper than this however. *Life* magazine recently characterized the Metho-

dist Church as "short on theology, long on good works, brilliantly organized, primarily middle-class, frequently bigoted, incurably optimistic, zealously missionary and touchingly confident of the essential goodness of the man next door." At Cleveland we were ascribing a doctrine to youth. The conflict is between man and man, we were saying, those on the side of God against those on the side of Satan. Youth attending the World Christian Youth Conference in Oslo, Norway, last summer found European youth concerned with the conflict between man and God. Perhaps we are still too distant from human tragedy to have learned much from the war and post-war. Certainly our theology lacks the depth of European youth.

I feel like commending the Cleveland Youth Conference. And I am not alone. The Cleveland

Plain-Dealer in an editorial on the closing day of the conference wrote:

"This conference of young people differs from many others in that it would employ the moral element to the solution of the problems of war, race prejudice and supernaturalism. Our feeling is that they are right in this viewpoint and their tired and jaded elders are wrong. No one has a right to criticize or prejudge their approach until it has been tried. And if history teaches anything it teaches that the time has come in human events to invoke the moral laws on a national and international scale."

Yet we must realize that getting up steam is not enough. A more careful examination of the road-bed might save this generation from the mental anguish that my generation has, and is still going through.

The World Church: News and Notes

Czechoslovakia: Impressions On the U.S.S.R.

After his return from the U.S.S.R., Dr. J. L. Hromadka, Dean of the Hus Faculty in Prague, answered a number of questions asked by a reporter of the evangelical weekly, "Kostnické Jiskry," concerning his recent journey.

Asked about his all-over impression of Soviet Russia, Dr. Hromadka declared: "Most of all I was impressed by the fact that in a comparatively short time the basis of Soviet life has broadened in an unprecedented manner. Society has become—as far as it is historically and sociologically possible—unified. Human dignity has grown and become established because there are new living conditions for the workers and farmers. This goes on in spite of great obstacles, and no doubt also with many mistakes. But when you watch masses of people you do not notice any social barriers among them. . . . Another strong impression is caused by the realization of the important place given to the real intelligentsia in public life. Only when you are there can you see how much time and energy are devoted to education, music, literature, etc., how much of the classical Russian education continues to flow into the veins of the Soviet citizen of today. . . . You also hear and feel that increased attention is paid to family life, and that in the relations among man and woman, boy and girl, the atmosphere is much cleaner and healthier than in Western countries or in Czechoslovakia . . ."

Asked about the possibility of a new young Russian humanitarianism and renaissance of Christian education, being brought about by Russian enthusiasm and by youth, Dr. Hromadka answered:

"This is a very hard question. I had two apparently opposite impressions. On one side it is obvious that the young generation is, at least in its most lively and active representatives, growing up completely without

any direct religious influence and education. On the other hand the interest is growing for all great eras of Russian history and for everything that created the individual nature of Russian education. Single great epochs and events of Russian history and the great Russian literature are a living part of today. And so much of what was formerly created under spiritual and cultural Christian influence, comes to today's Soviet citizen through the general spiritual atmosphere. I cannot say what will happen in the future. It is possible that a spiritual revival may take a direction of which today we have no idea."

Asked about the role of the Orthodox Church in Soviet spiritual life, Dr. Hromadka said: "I saw a few churches, I spoke to the present Russian Patriarch Alexis, and some other representatives of the Orthodox Church. . . . The Patriarch is an outstanding man who carries an immense burden of responsibility for the Church; he knows what the mission of the Church is and understands the spirit of our times. The number of seminaries is growing and two higher theological academies have been opened for the training of Seminary Professors and higher clergy. But I do not know whether the Orthodox Church will become the source of a spiritual life which will penetrate into the structure of today's Soviet society. Perhaps it will. But it is also possible that different sources of spiritual growth and effort will be opened."

E. P. S., Geneva.

A Call to Reorient Technical Culture

Our purpose is not to denounce the national planning and control of an economy, and certainly not to condone the kind of privateering which preceded it. We are considering the prospects of maintaining Britain's population in the space at its disposal, and for this purpose we find the argument between socialist and individualist methods worse than irrelevant. A doctrinaire adherence to either faction while making a

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion
537 West 121st St., New York 27, N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

JAMES C. BAKER	JOHN A. MACKAY
JOHN C. BENNETT	RHODA E. MCCULLOCH
CHARLES W. GILKEY	FRANCIS P. MILLER
F. EARNEST JOHNSON	EDWARD L. PARSONS
UMPHREY LEE	HOWARD C. ROBBINS
HENRY SMITH LEIPER	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
GLOSTER MORRIS, <i>Secretary of Editorial Board</i>	

scapegoat of the other, is indeed the usual way of evading the real problem. If we are going the wrong way, it does not greatly signify whether we hop on one foot or the other or proceed less oddly upon both; in any case we shall either come to grief or have to retrace our steps. The great hope of this distracted hour is that events are at last demonstrating beyond any possibility of mistake that nothing will serve but a re-orientation of technological culture; we are being obliged to face the deeper meanings of man's relation to his natural environment. The fallacy that technology of itself endows man with control of his situation dies hard, but it must yield at last to the sheer accumulation or contrary evidence. To mention a few points publicised in recent weeks — The American Department of Agriculture, which has its own views of the demands that the Marshall Plan will make upon it, begins to talk seriously of the danger of America's "exporting fertility" and to consider the capitalization of food production in South America: but the extension of the same problems to another sub-continent is obviously no solution of them. To come nearer home, there is no longer any attempt to argue that Britain is adequately fed because a defective supply is more evenly distributed. It is becoming evident that whether "man is a wolf toward man" or humanity is a wolf towards nature, the spiritual evil which makes him so is much the same, and so are the consequences.

This is not the first time that Christian civilization has been apparently doomed to fail before the forces of barbarism: this prospect has seemed practically in-

evitable to the most percipient spirits of the age every five hundred years—in the fifth, tenth and fifteenth centuries and now again in the twentieth. Twice before, the situation was retrieved by intensive religious movement: a sufficient number of people, it seemed, turned inward to the spirit and down to the earth. The last time, at the Renaissance, it seems to have been saved by a tremendous movement of extraversion, opportunity for which was provided by the discovery of the New World in the West. No such movement of extraversion can now save us, for we have fulfilled our space. The way out now must be inward and downward; an intensification of spirit, a turning away from quantitative exuberance, a recovery of quality of which the very sense is deteriorating. If and when this begins to happen it will not be in the newspapers, and we confess we have no idea what its precise effect will be upon the population or the food supply in this or that country. But it has occurred before, when Christian men have forsaken the world for the spirit, that they have not only moderated their sublunary desires. They have also stopped using their ingenuity in the production of insoluble problems: and incidentally they renewed the cultivation of the natural creation and restored the increase of the increase.

NEW ENGLISH WEEKLY.

Announcement:

At the annual meeting of the Board of Sponsors of *Christianity and Crisis*, it was decided to extend the scope of our journal. Since its inception it has been designed primarily to focus the attention of Christian people upon the international and social aspects of the world crisis. We shall attempt in the future to consider a wider range of issues, including those which are concerned with the character and function of the church, its relation to the culture of our day, and its faith and life. We shall try to bring the best possible counsel to bear upon such issues as the relation of Protestantism to Catholicism on the one hand and to secularism on the other. We shall deal with the relation of the church not only to the nation but to the problems of race; and we shall ask what can be done that Protestant bodies may learn more from each other in liturgical practice and theological thought. A full statement of our more inclusive purpose will be made in the next issue.

In an effort to bring greater cohesion into our editorial work, it was decided to reduce the board of editors to those who would find it possible to confer with one another frequently. We are asking other members of the editorial board to become contributors.

Periodical Division
Detroit Public Library
5201 Woodward Ave.
Detroit 2, Mich.

650 1-49

Author in This Issue

John D. Wolf is pastor of the Old North Methodist Church, Evansville, Indiana, a former Navy chaplain and instructor in the Naval Chaplains Training School.